



EAGLE BOA HOLDERS MEETING 06 November 2013



Agenda

- ☐ Registration 11:00 – 12:00 pm
- ☐ Start Meeting 12:00 pm
- ☐ Administrative Remarks
- ☐ Purpose of Meeting
- ☐ Opening Remarks
- ☐ EAGLE Status
- ☐ Communications
- ☐ Submission Process
- ☐ Evaluation Criteria
- ☐ Questions and Answers
- ☐ Closing Remarks 4:45 pm
- ☐ End Meeting 5:00 pm*

*Estimated ending time depending on length of Questions and Answers session



Administrative Remarks

- ☐ Restrooms
- ☐ Emergency Info
- ☐ Breaks
- ☐ Question Process



Purpose of Meeting

The purpose of the EAGLE BOA Holder Meeting is to dialogue with industry and address a number of issues identified in the BOA Holder feedback, discuss lessons learned, and obtain a greater understanding of EAGLE program execution.

- ☐ Note: There will be no discussion of specific task order competitions during this meeting.
- ☐ Note: Please note that answers from this session will not be final until provided in writing on the EAGLE Website.



Opening Remarks

Ms. Melanie Johnson

Executive Director, U.S. Army Contracting
Command – Rock Island (ACC-RI)



EAGLE Status

Ms. Cheryl Nielsen
Chief, EAGLE Contracting Branch
Army Contracting Command – Rock Island



EAGLE Status

- ☐ Task Order Competitions
 - Currently 128 BOA Holders (78 SB (25 8(a)) / 50 LB)
 - BOA Holders compete for task order awards among BOA Holders
 - Unrestricted – competed among 128 BOA Holders
 - SBSA – competed among 78 BOA Holders
 - 8(a) – competed among 25 BOA Holders
 - No limit to the number of BOA Holders – Contractors are provided the opportunity to “off-ramp” and cancel their BOAs during the Annual Review.
- ☐ BOA RFP #4 was issued on 11 OCT 2013, proposals are due on 12 NOV 2013. EAGLE requirements synopsized include:
 - Fort Knox, Afghanistan Maintenance, APS-3 Charleston, APS-4 Korea, APS-4 Watercraft, Yuma Proving Grounds, and West Point.
- ☐ BOA Holder Teaming Arrangement Addition/Revision window opened on 11 OCT 2013. Additions/Revisions were received 25 OCT 2013.



EAGLE Status

Teammate Guide and Attachment 0002 Teaming Arrangement Template



EAGLE Status

EAGLE Task Order Acquisition Strategy

CONUS Installation Logistics **

- Annual Requirements \leq \$1M - executed by the local Installation Contracting Office
- Annual Requirements $>$ \$1M and \leq \$35.5M, Small Business Set-Aside – executed by ACC-RI
- Annual Requirements $>$ \$35.5M, “Rule of 2”, otherwise Unrestricted – executed by ACC-RI

Non-Installation Logistics**

- No annual dollar threshold – executed by ACC-RI, unless otherwise stated in task order RFP
- “Rule of 2” to determine set-aside; otherwise Unrestricted

** Any requirement that is an 8(a) contract action will remain an 8(a) requirement under EAGLE



EAGLE Status

“Rule of 2” – EAGLE Task Order Acquisition Strategy (Con’t)

- ☐ Market Research will be performed prior to Task Order competitions in Step 3 for those requirements that are non-DOL and DOL <\$35.5M.
- ☐ Market Research will consist of an analysis of information received on EAGLE Task Order RFP submissions and resultant EAGLE Task Order awards.
- ☐ If analysis indicates a reasonable expectation that two or more proposals will be received from responsible Small Business BOA Holders with the capacity and capability to perform the requirement at a fair and reasonable price, under the Rule of 2, the requirement will be solicited as SBSA.
- ☐ To date, 6 Task Orders have been awarded. Information received on the RFP submissions and resultant awards will be utilized for future EAGLE Task Orders on determining the “Rule of 2” on requirements that exceed \$35.5M threshold as well as determining other potential small business set-aside strategies, i.e., small women owned, small veteran owned, etc.



EAGLE Status

Task Order Acquisition Strategy (Con't)

☐ Changes to Strategy

- Developed initially using historical data from incumbent contracts
- As task order Procurement Package Input (PPI), i.e., PWS and Independent Government Estimate, is finalized (taking into consideration future workload changes), strategy may change.

☐ Best Value vs. LPTA

- Based upon complexity of each task order

☐ Numerous SBSA RFPs issued close together

- EAGLE Award milestones are driven by mission need



EAGLE Status

Task Order Awards to Date

- ☐ US Army Reserves Command (USARC)
 - Awarded 29 AUG 2013 to XO-Tech LLC (Hybrid Best Value Trade-off)
- ☐ Fort Campbell
 - Awarded 12 SEP 2013 to DynCorp International LLC (Hybrid Best Value Trade-off)
- ☐ Fort Benning
 - Awarded 13 SEP 2013 to ABM Government Services (Hybrid Best Value Trade-off)
- ☐ Fort Gordon
 - Awarded 27 SEP 2013 to Wolverine Services, LLC (Hybrid Best Value Trade-off)
- ☐ Redstone Arsenal
 - Awarded 27 SEP 2013 to Technica LLC (Hybrid Best Value Trade-off)
- ☐ Presidio of Monterey
 - Awarded 28 SEP 2013 to Hurricane Consulting Inc. (LPTA)



EAGLE Status

Current RFP Releases

- ☐ APS-5 Kuwait, (Unrestricted/Best Value) issued 26 Apr 2013, proposals received 25 July 2013, in evaluation
- ☐ Fort Hood, TX (SBSA/Best Value) issued 14 Dec 2012, proposals received 18 April 2013, in evaluation
- ☐ Fort Polk, LA, (Unrestricted/Best Value) issued 09 Sep 2013, proposals received 29 Oct 2013, in evaluation
- ☐ Schofield Barracks, HI (SBSA/Best Value) issued 27 Sep 2013, proposals due 18 Nov 2013
- ☐ Detroit Arsenal, MI (SBSA/LPTA), issued 21 Oct 2013, proposals due 9 Dec 2013
- ☐ Fort Bliss, TX, (SBSA/Best Value) issued 24 Oct 2013, proposals due 25 Nov 2013
- ☐ Fort Huachuca, AZ (SBSA/LPTA), issued 28 Oct 2013, proposals due 02 Dec 2013.
- ☐ Fort Irwin, CA (8 (a)/Best Value), Projected issuance 8 Nov 2013, proposal estimated due date 13 Dec 2013



EAGLE Status

Future FY14 RFP Releases

- ❑ Estimated RFP Issuance Notice on EAGLE Website includes estimated RFP issue dates and updated regularly:
 - Aberdeen Proving Ground, NJ, Nov 13, 8(a)
 - Fort Lee, VA, Dec 13, SBSA
 - Afghanistan*, Mar 14, Unrestricted
 - APS-4 Watercraft*, Jan 14, Unrestricted
 - APS-4 Northeast Asia (Korea)*, Jan 14, Unrestricted
 - APS-3 Charleston, SC*, Jan 14, Unrestricted
 - Fort Knox, KY*, Jan 14, 8(a)
 - West Point, NY*, Mar 14, 8(a)
 - Yuma Proving Ground, AZ*, Jun 14, SBSA

*Task orders were advertised under the 4th BOA process which is estimated for completion late Jan 14. Task Order RFPs will not be issued until BOA 4 process has been completed.



EAGLE Status

Anticipated Year 3 Requirements

- ❑ Estimated RFP issue dates will be released when the requirements are synopsized in Federal Business Opportunities (May 2014):
- Fort Riley, KS, 1st Qtr FY 15, SBSA
 - Dugway Proving Ground, UT, 1st Qtr FY 15, 8(a)
 - Fort Detrick, MD, 1st Qtr FY 15, 8(a)
 - Fort Bragg, NC, 1st Qtr FY15, Unrestricted
 - Fort Stewart, GA, 2nd Qtr FY 15, SBSA
 - White Sands, NM, 2nd Qtr FY 15, SBSA
 - Camp Attebury, IN, 2nd Qtr FY 15, SBSA
 - Camp Shelby, MS, 2nd Qtr FY 15, SBSA



EAGLE Status

Anticipated Year 3 Requirements (Con't)

- Fort Wainwright, AK, 2nd Qtr FY 15, SBSA
- JB Elmendorf-Richardson, AK, 2nd Qtr FY 15, SBSA
- Fort Dix, NJ, 2nd Qtr FY 15, SBSA
- Fort Drum, NY, 2nd Qtr FY 15, SBSA
- Fort Rucker, AL, 2nd Qtr FY 15, SBSA
- Fort McCoy, WI, 3rd Qtr FY 15, SBSA



Communications

Ms. Karen McElhiney

Contract Specialist

EAGLE Contracting Branch

Army Contracting Command – Rock Island



Communications

❑ EAGLE Inquiries

- Efforts have been made to be more responsive to EAGLE inquiries from BOA Holders and Industry at large.
 - Task Order responses require the coordination of multiple support offices.
 - EAGLE Contracting Team working towards a 48 hour response time.
- Currently there are 128 BOA Holders. Some inquiries may take longer than others and go beyond the objective response time.
- If no response is received in a reasonable amount of time, please continue to follow up to ensure your questions are answered.



Communications

Draft Documentation

- The Government has tried to broaden the scope of information provided to BOA Holders as well as improve the timing of the information release.
 - Draft RFPs, PWSs, Workload data, Collective Bargaining Agreements, etc.
 - Intent is to provide the draft documentation as early as possible in the process.
- Feedback is paramount to this process. To date, the feedback received on the draft documentation has been limited.
 - Without constructive feedback, issues will not be resolved in the planning stages of the procurement process.



Communications

☐ Release of Request for Proposals (RFP)

- The Government has worked to standardize its RFP process where possible. RFPs linked to ASFI will be posted on the EAGLE Website via a Word document.
 - The Word document is utilized in order to communicate task order procurement specific information and announcements.
- Attachments/Exhibits that are releasable to public view will be included with the RFP posting on ASFI.
- PCO/Contract Specialist will email BOA Holders that an RFP or Amendment was issued.
 - Attachments/Exhibits that are not releasable to public view will be attached to email(s) notification.
 - If it is necessary to release an RFP at the end of the day, all attachments and exhibits will be sent with email notification.
- Responsibility is still on the BOA Holder to check EAGLE Website and FedBizOpps for updates.



Communications

☐ BOA Holder Points of Contact (POCs)

- There has been concern from BOA Holders about POCs not receiving emails.
 - BOA Holder distribution lists are continually updated.
- BOA related issues and draft documentation will be sent to the POCs listed on the BOA Holder's Attachment 0003 – Current POC Information.
- Evaluation Notices (ENs) will be sent to the ASSIST POCs provided in the Task Order proposal.
- If experiencing difficulties receiving emails, ensure your POC information is up to date and the email addresses are accurate.
 - To update a POC, send a revised Attachment 0003 – Current POC Information to the EAGLE mailbox.
- If POC information is correct and you are still experiencing difficulties, send an email to the EAGLE mailbox.



Communications

❑ Status of Proposals

- Requests have come in regarding providing status as to where proposals are in the evaluation process.
 - The Government is unable to provide specific status to BOA Holders as to where proposals are in the evaluation process. However, based on the receipt of ENs or other notices, Offerors should have a general understanding of the progress of the evaluation.



Communications

❑ Face to Face Meetings

- Multiple inquiries have come in requesting individual meetings and meet and greets with the EAGLE Contracting Team.
 - The Government is unable to accommodate individual meetings and meet and greets and must be fair to all BOA Holders.
- Due to the number of task order competitions taking place simultaneously, it is imperative that the integrity of the procurement process be preserved.
 - By limiting face to face contact to all BOA Holders, the Government is providing equal treatment while ensuring there is no appearance of preferential treatment.



Communications

❑ Site Visits and Debriefings

- A substantial amount of feedback has been received regarding the execution of site visits and debriefings.
 - The Government follows strict guidelines for site visits and debriefings.

❑ Site Visits

- The Government is required to notify the site and the incumbent of any site visit and cannot require the incumbent to be present for the site visit.
- Site visits must remain fair for those BOA Holders that are unable to attend.
 - BOA Holders are not allowed to ask the site personnel any questions.
 - All questions must be put in writing.
- If BOA Holders require additional information to be provided for site visits, submit a request to the Government for consideration.



Communications

- ☐ Site Visits and Debriefings (Continued)
- ☐ Debriefings
 - All debriefings will be conducted according to the FAR.
 - Recent debriefings were impacted by the Government shutdown.
 - It is the Government's intent to conduct all future debriefings orally.
 - Debriefing slides will be provided to BOA Holder just prior to the actual debriefing.



Communications

❑ EAGLE Website

- The EAGLE Website is still undergoing review for reorganization.
 - The EAGLE Website reorganization is taking longer than anticipated due to the Government shutdown and switching from a local server to the server at HQACC.
- The reorganization of the EAGLE Website will not only take into account a more efficient presentation of the material and lead to easier navigation but also properly archive older information so it is readily available as source material.
 - The intent is to have a separate link to each installation (Fort Hood, Fort Bliss, etc). That link will contain all relevant information to include solicitation links, updates and Q&As.
- At this time the Government does not have a firm date for the completion of the website reorganization, but it is being worked.



Communications

EAGLE Website Redesign



Army Contracting Command – Rock Island

Supporting Army Sustainment Command, Joint Munitions and Lethality LCMC, JCC-I/A, & Chemical Materials Agency

Enhanced Army Global Logistics Enterprise (EAGLE) Program

The appearance of external hyperlinks does not constitute endorsement by the Army Sustainment Command (ASC) of these Web sites or the information, products or services contained therein. For other than authorized activities such as military exchanges and Morale, Welfare and Recreation sites, the ASC does not exercise any editorial control over the information you may find at these locations. These links are provided consistent with the stated purposes of this military Web site.

BOA HOLDER INFORMATION **UPDATED-26 Jun 2013** (this will link to a 2nd level)

STEP 3 (this will link to a 2nd level)

STEP 2 (this will link to a 2nd level)

STEP 1 (this will link to a 2nd level)

MISCELLANEOUS INFO (this will link to a 2nd level) (for this particular link, it is only 2 levels deep.)

AWARDED (this will link to a 2nd level)



Communications

EAGLE Website Redesign



Army Contracting Command – Rock Island

Supporting Army Sustainment Command, Joint Munitions and Lethality LCMC, JCC-I/A, & Chemical Materials Agency

Enhanced Army Global Logistics Enterprise (EAGLE) Program

The appearance of external hyperlinks does not constitute endorsement by the Army Sustainment Command (ASC) of these Web sites or the information, products or services contained therein. For other than authorized activities such as military exchanges and Morale, Welfare and Recreation sites, the ASC does not exercise any editorial control over the information you may find at these locations. These links are provided consistent with the stated purposes of this military Web site.

STEP 3 (bread crumb)

Unauthorized site visits are not allowed. Information to register for a site visit can be found in Section A of the respective task order solicitations.

Fort Lee, VA

Fort Benning, GA

Presidio of Monterey, CA

Fort Polk, LA

U.S. Army Reserve Command (USARC)

Redstone Arsenal, AL

Fort Campbell, KY

APS-5 Kuwait

Fort Gordon, GA

Fort Hood, TX



Communications

EAGLE Website Redesign



Army Contracting Command – Rock Island

Supporting Army Sustainment Command, Joint Munitions and Lethality LCMC, JCC-I/A, & Chemical Materials Agency

Enhanced Army Global Logistics Enterprise (EAGLE) Program

The appearance of external hyperlinks does not constitute endorsement by the Army Sustainment Command (ASC) of these Web sites or the information, products or services contained therein. For other than authorized activities such as military exchanges and Morale, Welfare and Recreation sites, the ASC does not exercise any editorial control over the information you may find at these locations. These links are provided consistent with the stated purposes of this military Web site.

STEP 2 (bread crumb)

BOA RFP W52P1J-13-R-0032

W52P1J-12-R-0198 Q&As (Archive Copy)

Questions & Answers



Communications

EAGLE Website Redesign



Army Contracting Command – Rock Island

Supporting Army Sustainment Command, Joint Munitions and Lethality LCMC, JCC-I/A, & Chemical Materials Agency

Enhanced Army Global Logistics Enterprise (EAGLE) Program

The appearance of external hyperlinks does not constitute endorsement by the Army Sustainment Command (ASC) of these Web sites or the information, products or services contained therein. For other than authorized activities such as military exchanges and Morale, Welfare and Recreation sites, the ASC does not exercise any editorial control over the information you may find at these locations. These links are provided consistent with the stated purposes of this military Web site.

STEP 1 (bread crumb)

12 Mar 2012 - Responses to contractor submissions for Step One have been sent



Communications

EAGLE Website Redesign



Army Contracting Command – Rock Island

Supporting Army Sustainment Command, Joint Munitions and Lethality LCMC, JCC-I/A, & Chemical Materials Agency

Enhanced Army Global Logistics Enterprise (EAGLE) Program

The appearance of external hyperlinks does not constitute endorsement by the Army Sustainment Command (ASC) of these Web sites or the information, products or services contained therein. For other than authorized activities such as military exchanges and Morale, Welfare and Recreation sites, the ASC does not exercise any editorial control over the information you may find at these locations. These links are provided consistent with the stated purposes of this military Web site.

MISCELLANEOUS INFO (bread crumb)

[Possible ASFI Assistance](#)

[EAGLE ABPI Brief 23 May 2013](#)

[ASFI in Step Two](#)

[Vendor Bid Response System Guide](#)

[Industry Day Sign-Up List - 17-18 May 2010](#)

[Chicago Breakout Session Aug-Sept 2010 Participants](#)

[EAGLE QC Chamber brief - 17 APR 2012](#)

[Rule of Two - 07 Mar 12](#)

[EAGLE Program Acronyms & Abbreviations](#)

[Known DOL Contracts & FIRST Task Orders, Updated 02SEP2010](#)

[Directorate of Logistics, 26AUG2010](#)

[EAGLE brief for NDIA Small Business Conference 17 Nov 2011](#)

[Basic Ordering Agreement training at NDIA Small Business Conference 17 Nov 2011](#)

[EAGLE Contact Information](#)



Communications

EAGLE Website Redesign



Army Contracting Command – Rock Island

Supporting Army Sustainment Command, Joint Munitions and Lethality LCMC, JCC-I/A, & Chemical Materials Agency

Enhanced Army Global Logistics Enterprise (EAGLE) Program

The appearance of external hyperlinks does not constitute endorsement by the Army Sustainment Command (ASC) of these Web sites or the information, products or services contained therein. For other than authorized activities such as military exchanges and Morale, Welfare and Recreation sites, the ASC does not exercise any editorial control over the information you may find at these locations. These links are provided consistent with the stated purposes of this military Web site.

AWARDED (bread crumb)

Rock Island Arsenal Logistics Support Services



Submission Process

Ms. Jana McElliott
Contract Specialist
EAGLE Contracting Branch
Army Contracting Command – Rock Island



Submission Process

- ☐ Length of time between RFP issuance and closing date
 - Issue draft RFP
 - Issue draft workload data

- ☐ Standardization of solicitation documents
 - Naming Conventions
 - Page numbers
 - Headers to include Attachment Name & Number



Submission Process

☐ Submission of Cost & Pricing Data

- Cost data will be required on every task order to ensure it is current, accurate and complete. There may be changes in a contractor's business base, and its budget forecasts may change throughout the year due to updated information.
- Offerors and Subcontractors over \$1,000,000 shall provide a detailed cost element in order to allow the Government to perform an adequate cost realism review of its proposed costs. Offerors shall refer to the individual Task Order RFP for specific submission instructions.
- Clarifying language has recently been added to task order RFPs which states that no cost data is required for the teammate/subcontractor (or affiliated divisions/subsidiaries, etc.) selected on a competitive basis, therefore, if the prime offeror selected a proposed teammate/subcontractor (or affiliated divisions/subsidiaries, etc.) on a competitive basis, the prime offeror shall only provide its basis for the competitive selection.



Submission Process

❑ Proposal Submission – Electronic vs. Hard Copy

- ASFI is standard method for posting RFPs and attachments and for initial proposal submission
- If hard copies are required, we will attempt to allow one full business day between weekends/holidays and due date

❑ Subcontractor Proposal Submission

- Initial proposals submitted through ASFI
 - If proposing under multiple teams, submit a separate proposal for each
 - If submitting multiple versions of the same proposal, send an email specifying which submission to use
- Interim and/or Final proposals submitted through ASSIST
 - Primes are responsible for providing instructions to Teammates/Subs
 - Teammates/Subs are responsible for registering themselves in ASSIST



Submission Process

❑ Changes to the RFP

- We cannot issue amendments or amended attachments/exhibits with tracked changes
- Amendments are official documents that become part of the contract file, and therefore cannot contain tracked changes
- Section A Narrative clearly outlines where all changes can be found



Submission Process

- ❑ Standardizing Evaluation Notice (EN) Response Method
 - Items for Negotiation (IFNs) vs. Evaluation Notices (ENs)
 - ASSIST is standard method; however, exceptions do occur
- ❑ Turnaround time for Evaluation Notices (ENs) and Proposal Revisions
 - Ensure consistency between EN response and proposal
 - Ensure consistency among proposal volumes
 - Implement standard turnaround times
 - T&C EN: 1 Business Day
 - Factor EN: 2 Business Days
 - EN + Proposal Revision/FPR: 5 Business Days



Submission Process

- ❑ Decreasing Time to Submit RFP Questions
 - Site Visit: All questions submitted NLT 3 business days after site visit.
 - No Site Visit: All questions submitted NLT 10 business days after RFP issue date.



Submission Process

- ❑ Strict compliance with RFP proposal submission requirements will be enforced in future EAGLE solicitations
 - Example:
 - The Offeror shall include one executed signed copy of the solicitation titled, “Solicitation, Offer and Award” SF33.
 - Naming Convention: Offerors_Name_Vol_1_SF33
 - File Format: Adobe or MS Word
 - Page Limit: None
 - Failure to provide the signed SF33 shall render the offeror’s proposal incomplete. The proposal will not be evaluated and will not be further considered for award.



Evaluation Criteria

Ms. Cassie Flynn
Contract Specialist
EAGLE Contracting Branch
Army Contracting Command – Rock Island



Evaluation Criteria

Technical Evaluation Issues



Evaluation Criteria

☐ Workload Data Format

- The Government will not provide Workload Data in Excel format.
- Protect integrity of the procurement process.

☐ Workload Data Standardization

- The Government will continue to offer the minimum productive hours in a standard format. Changes can be expected as lessons are learned and efficiencies are identified.
- Workload format and content will differ due to installation specific requirements; every effort will be made to ensure data is standardized to the maximum extent practicable.



Evaluation Criteria

☐ Workload Data – Provide Staffing by Labor Category

- The Government does not plan to provide staffing by labor category.
- The Government is evaluating if the offeror demonstrates an understanding of the PWS requirements and provides an acceptable proposal that meets the minimum requirements of each task order RFP.
- Offerors may apply innovative staffing solutions while still meeting the minimum productive hours through cross utilization of personnel/ FTEs.
 - It is imperative that any cross functional assignments proposed are made perfectly clear to the Government.



Evaluation Criteria

☐ Technical Volume Page Limits.

- The Government has no plans at this time to increase page limits for technical submissions.
- The Government has limited page counts in order to facilitate, as much as possible, an efficient and effective evaluation process.

☐ Mission Essential Contractor Services Page Restrictions.

- We have received and continue to receive acceptable proposals at the current page count.
- Please note, the Government is evaluating the offeror's plan for how it will continue to perform the essential contractor services in accordance with DFARs 252.237-7024(b)(2)(i-v); after award, additional installation-specific information may be required in accordance with the applicable CDRL.



Evaluation Criteria

- ☐ Proposal Text Size for Header, Footer, and Graphic/Table/Spreadsheet.
 - The Government has no intention at this time to allow other than standard 12 point text.
 - Different text sizes were allowed in the past, however, this caused issues in proposal submissions.



Evaluation Criteria

Past Performance Evaluation Issues



Evaluation Criteria

☐ Past Performance Evaluations Recommendations.

- Recommendations to assist in Past Performance Evaluations:
 - Accurate POC information for past performance references.
 - If Evaluation Notices (ENs) are received in regards to negative past performance information discovered about a teammate or major subcontractor, address mitigation strategies to reduce the risk posed by the issues in the EN as the Prime Offeror, i.e. Quality Assurance, Processes, etc.



Evaluation Criteria

BOA Past Performance Evaluations versus Task Order Past Performance Evaluations

- The EAGLE BOA process serves as a method to allow a wide variety of companies to compete for the various EAGLE requirements, as well as ensuring offerors possess a basic organizational capability for maintenance, supply, and transportation.
- The Step 2 BOA process does not focus on the specific requirements needed at the installation.
- The Step 3 Task Order Process focuses on awarding a task order to meet the specific requirements of an installation.



Evaluation Criteria

☐ EAGLE Rules on Past Performance Evaluations. (Question: “EAGLE only evaluates subs past performance who receive 20% or more of the contract. However, Small business represents at least 39% of any large prime's bid. Will the government allow a large business to submit past performance for small businesses whether any one of them have 20% or not - especially if the large business is not self-sufficient in one or more functional areas (maintenance, supply or transportation)?”)

- Refer to the individual RFP instructions.
- The Government will not assess an additional reference provided with the Offeror’s current proposal if the reference is for a teammate or subcontractor not expected to perform 20% or more of the total value of the contract.



Evaluation Criteria

☐ Past Performance Evaluation Factors – (Question: Specify the factors the Government is using in determining a "substantial confidence" rating beyond recency and relevancy.)

- In accordance with Paragraph 3.1.3 of DOD Source Selection Procedures:
 - The past performance evaluation results in an assessment of the offeror's probability of meeting the solicitation requirements. The past performance evaluation considers each offeror's demonstrated recent and relevant record of performance in supplying products and services that meet the contract's requirements. One performance confidence assessment rating is assigned for each offeror after evaluating the offeror's recent past performance, focusing on performance that is relevant to the contract requirements.
- Refer to Section M of the individual Task Order RFPs for the performance confidence ratings and definitions.



Evaluation Criteria

☐ Magnitude Determination Thresholds - (Question: “Will the Government consider reviewing these thresholds and revising the values?”)

- The Government is currently reviewing these thresholds.
- The thresholds used for each individual Task Order RFP are determined based on the requirement’s complexity and magnitude in order to evaluate references of similar magnitude and complexity.



Evaluation Criteria

Cost/Price Evaluation Issues



Evaluation Criteria

□ Cost Realism Analysis/Most Probable Cost Adjustments.

- Cost Realism determines:
 - Whether the estimated proposed cost elements are realistic for the work to be performed;
 - Reflect a clear understanding of the requirements;
 - Consistent with the unique methods of performance described in the Technical Proposal.
 - Will only be performed on Technically Acceptable proposals.
- Most Probable Cost Determination:
 - The probable cost may differ from the proposed cost and reflects the Government's best estimate of the cost of any contract that is likely to result from the Offeror's proposal.
 - In the event the Government is required to execute a probable cost adjustment, the probable cost is determined by adjusting each offeror's proposed cost, and fee when appropriate, to reflect any additions or reductions in cost elements to realistic levels based on the results of the cost realism analysis.
- Total Evaluated Cost. The Total Evaluated Cost will be the total of the Offeror's submitted cost proposal as detailed in the Cost/Price Matrix (Attachment 0005) plus any Government identified probable cost adjustments as determined IAW FAR 15.404-1(d) cost realism analysis.



Evaluation Criteria

☐ Performance Bonds - (Question: “Will the government consider requiring performance bonds in the future to prevent unrealistic bids?”)

- The Government has no intent at this time to require performance bonds.
- To prevent unrealistic offers, the Government utilizes Cost Realism Analysis as part of its Cost/Price evaluation in accordance with FAR 15.404-1(d)(2).
- If an offeror’s costs/rates are determined to be unrealistic, the Government will cap the offeror to its proposed costs/rates for future billing (if awarded the contract).



Evaluation Criteria

☐ Transition Cost. (Question: “Other government organizations including Army organizations give a "bogie" cost for all competitors to use to level the competitive playing field. Is a "bogie" cost going to be assigned to each task order to level the playing field?”)

- There are no plans to add a “bogie” cost to future task orders.
- EAGLE evaluates the FFP Transition CLIN separately for Cost Reasonableness/Cost Realism
 - The offeror will be held to those proposed costs as it is a FFP requirement.
- It is a business decision of the offeror on what to propose for transition costs.



Evaluation Criteria

- ☐ Standard Pricing Models. (Question: “Providing industry with standard pricing templates for all positions would considerably reduce cost and workload for both government and industry.”)
- The Government has no plans to provide standard pricing templates.
 - Offerors should propose according to RFP instructions, including FAR 15.408 and Table 15-2.
 - Costs will be evaluated for cost reasonableness and cost realism in accordance with FAR 15.404-1(c) and 15.404-1(d).



Evaluation Criteria

General Evaluation Issues



Evaluation Criteria

☐ Task Order Evaluation Lengths. (Question: “Can the EAGLE office address how they will shorten proposal evaluations?”)

- The EAGLE office makes every effort to perform evaluations as efficiently as possible, however, the primary goal is to conduct fair and thorough evaluations.
- We utilize lessons learned from each Task Order solicitation to improve workload data, PWS documents, and solicitation language.
- We plan to utilize the Lowest Priced Technically Acceptable (LPTA) approach for the less complex requirements when it is reasonable.
- Future Eagle Task Order RFPs have very strict compliance requirements that the offerors will need to pay close attention to (for example page limits). Please read all sections of the solicitation thoroughly. Additionally, to improve upon future task order proposals, please refer back to the deficiencies provided to you in previous evaluations in an effort to avoid future deficiencies. Due to the strict compliance requirements in future task orders, RFP offerors may not have the opportunity to engage in discussions with the Government and, therefore, will be unable to correct deficiencies.
- May limit the competitive range in accordance with FAR 15.306(c)(2) for purposes of efficiency.



Evaluation Criteria

❑ Task Order Evaluation Lengths (Con't)

- There are ways you can help:
- BOA RFP:
 - Read and understand the RFP, specifically Sections L and M, in its entirety, and ensure the proposal is submitted in accordance with those instructions. Please pay close attention to the Instructions for Attachment 0002, EAGLE Organizational Capability and Similar Experience Worksheet, and follow them precisely.
 - Past performance information submitted in response to a BOA Step 2 RFP will be used in the Step 3 task order competitions. Ensure any information provided for past performance is consistent and accurate throughout your proposal.
- Task Order RFP:
 - Adhere to proposal page limit and format instructions
 - Ensure submittal of all required cost/price proposal cost data for Prime and Teammates/Subcontractors
 - Utilizing BOA past performance references for task order evaluation – no need for submittal of additional references (unless there is new Past Performance information since BOA was issued)
 - Ensure Contract Numbers and POCs provided for additional Past Performance information are correct
 - Submit questions regarding the instructions provided in the BOA or task order RFPs to the EAGLE mailbox at usarmy.RIA.acc.mbx.eagle@mail.mil in a timely manner.



Evaluation Criteria

☐ (Question: “Certain attachments are repetitious in information/data required. Attachment 0010-Teaming Matrix, Attachment 0014-Contract Participation Matrix and Attachment 0016-Teammate/Subcontractor Proposal Submittal Crosswalk all ask for similar information within them. Attachment 0002-Staffing/Labor Mix and the Consolidated FTE Table ask for similar information in each document as well. Will the Government combine portions of the attachments that require similar information?”)

- Attachment 0014-Contract Participation Matrix is only required on an Unrestricted Task Order RFP. If Attachment 0014 is required, Attachment 0010-Teaming Matrix will not be required. Likewise, if Attachment 0010-Teaming Matrix is required, Attachment 0014 will not be required.
- Attachment 0016-Teammate/Subcontractor Proposal Submittal Crosswalk will be required on each RFP to allow Teammates/Subcontractors to submit their own information through ASFI. This ensures all documents are received by allowing the Government to track the receipt of an Offeror’s entire proposal, including receipt of its Teammate/Subcontractors’ proposals.



Evaluation Criteria

❑ Common Mistakes made by Offerors

- Proposal Documents:
 - Providing files in an incorrect format
 - Exceeding Page Limits
 - Providing documents with the same file name
 - Not filling out clauses in Section I and Section K
 - Not signing Amendments
 - Not including Letters of Consent
- Past Performance References:
 - Providing an incorrect contract number
 - Providing incorrect Point of Contact information for reference



Evaluation Criteria

☐ Common Mistakes made by Offerors (Cont.)

- Cost/ Price

- Lack of supporting cost data (primes and teammates/ subcontractors) in accordance with Section L and FAR 15.408, Table 15-2.
- Inconsistent proposal information between prime and teammate/ subcontractor proposals.
- Lack of Historical and Budgetary data or data provided does not support Indirect Rates proposed.

- Small Business Participation Factor

- Not matching the total contract value in Attachment 0014 - Contract Participation Matrix with the total evaluated Cost/Price in Attachment 0005- Cost/Price Matrix

OPTION PERIODS ONLY

Note: Formulate productive hours and FTE counts for one 12 month period

Refer to L.5.2.1 (ii)(2)

EXAMPLE

Option Period Productive hours per FTE:

Hours Per Year	Category
1920	Exempt
1816	CBA I
1872	CBA 2
1920	SCA (non-CBA)

FILL IN HOURS (i.e. 1880, 1920, etc...)
And employee type (i.e. CBA, SCA, Exempt)

		5.6 Army and Clinic	5.7 Radiology	5.8 Gen. Surgical	5.9 Dental	5.10 Ortho Surgical
CBA / SCA / Exempt	Labor Category	FTE Count	FTE Count	FTE Count	FTE Count	FTE Count
Exempt	Medical Doctor, General Practice	1.00				
SCA - 12071	Licensed Practical Nurse I	2.00		1.00		3.00
SCA - 01280	Receptionist	1.00		1.00	1.00	1.00
Exempt	Surgeon, Ortho			1.00		2.00
SCA - 01013	Accounting Clerk III	4.00				
SCA - 01052	Data Entry Operator II	2.00		1.00	1.00	2.00
CBA I	Supply Technician	1.00				
SCA - 12020	Dental Assistant				1.00	
Exempt	Dentist				1.00	
Exempt	Dentist (part time)				0.50	
SCA - 12305	Radiologic Technologist		1.00			
CBA 2	Dispatcher, Motor Vehicle	2.00				
Work Area Totals		13.00	1.00	4.00	4.50	8.00
Total Proposed FTEs		30.50				

BASE PERIOD ONLY

Note: Formulate base period productive hours for 9 months of Fully Operational Capable staffing. FTE counts are to match tab 'FTE Count Option Periods 1-4'. Refer to L.5.2.1.4(ii)(2)

Base Period Productive hours per FTE:

Hours Per Year	Category
1440	Exempt
1362	CBA I
1404	CBA 2
1440	SCA (non-CBA)

FILL IN HOURS (i.e. 1600, 1673, etc...)
And employee type (i.e. CBA, SCA, Exempt)

EXAMPLE

5.6 Army Med Clinic	5.7 Radiology	5.8 Gen. Surgical	5.9 Dental	5.10 Ortho Surgical
------------------------	------------------	----------------------	---------------	------------------------

CBA / SCA / Exempt	Labor Category	FTE Count	FTE Count	FTE Count	FTE Count	FTE Count
Exempt	Medical Doctor, General Practice	1.00				
SCA - I207I	Licensed Practical Nurse I	2.00		1.00		3.00
SCA - 01280	Receptionist	1.00		1.00	1.00	1.00
Exempt	Surgeon, Ortho			1.00		2.00
SCA - 01013	Accounting Clerk III	4.00				
SCA - 01052	Data Entry Operator II	2.00		1.00	1.00	2.00
CBA I	Supply Technician	1.00				
SCA - I2020	Dental Assistant				1.00	
Exempt	Dentist				1.00	
Exempt	Dentist (part time)				0.50	
SCA - I2305	Radiologic Technologist		1.00			
CBA 2	Dispatcher, Motor Vehicle	2.00				
	Work Area Totals	13.00	1.00	4.00	4.50	8.00
	Total Proposed FTEs	30.50				



Evaluation Criteria

❑ Common Mistakes made by Offerors (Con't)

■ Technical Proposal Documents:

- Attachment 0002 and Cost Price Volume need to match in hours and FTEs
- Quality Control Organization should be independent of the Project Manager
- Transition timelines do not have to account for every possible step and sub-step in transition; please refer to Sections L & M to ensure the required components are identified.
- Primary Task Areas are those requirements identified in Section 5 Table of Contents of the PWS. Please note: In some task orders, Offerors may not be required to propose to ALL Primary Task Areas listed in Section 5 Table of Contents of the PWS. It is very important to match the data from Section 5 Table of Contents of the PWS to the workload data provided to identify the Primary Task Areas for each RFP.
- It is the Offeror's responsibility to ensure the Government has a clear understanding of its intended approach. If the Offeror intends to utilize one labor category to cover multiple functions, the offeror must identify this approach in its Attachment 0002 (i.e., General Clerk II/ Production Control Clerk). Additionally, it is the Offeror's responsibility to ensure it complies with the Department of Labor regulations.



QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS



Closing Remarks

- ☐ Briefing will be posted to the EAGLE Website
- ☐ All questions and answers will be posted to the EAGLE Website